EXHIBIT 14

EXHIBIT 5

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MIDLAND-ODESSA DIVISION

REDSTONE LOGICS LLC,	)	MO:24-CV-00028-ADA-DTG
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	WACO, TEXAS
NXP SEMICONDUCTORS N.V., NXP B.V., NXP USA, INC.,	)	
Defendants.	)	FEBRUARY 19, 2025
REDSTONE LOGICS LLC,	)	MO:24-CV-00029-ADA-DTG
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	WACO, TEXAS
MEDIATEK, INC., MEDIATEK USA, INC.,	)	
Defendants.	)	FEBRUARY 19, 2025

****

TRANSCRIPT OF CLAIMS CONSTRUCTION HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE RONALD C. GRIFFIN

****

FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
CHRISTIAN W. CONKLE
QI (PETER) TONG
JOSHUA SCHEUFLER
RUSS AUGUST & KABAT
12424 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, 12TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025

FOR THE DEFENDANTS:
ERIC CONLEY GREEN
BRETT A. MCKEAN
NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP
98 SAN JACINTO BOULEVARD, SUITE 1100
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701

RICHARD S. ZEMBEK
NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP
1550 LAMAR STREET, SUITE 2000
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77010

clarification on that with this definition so that the parties will know how to frame both invalidity and infringement briefs. So, with that, Mr. Scheufler, are you handling this?

MR. SCHEUFLER: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Very good. Whenever you're ready.

MR. SCHEUFLER: All right. Well, I'd like to jump right in it, then. You asked about whether a single clock source -- whether we would need a single clock source or multiple clock sources, and that being the maybe rub. And I think the claim language itself provides us the answer.

The claim language says that first clock signal is independent from the second clock signal. Not that they're independent from a common source, but it is with respect to each other.

So looking at what NXP has argued, I call this the mathematical version of "independence." The purely mathematical approach is to say that, well, if any part of a component of your final outcome is common, then they are not independent.

But looking at this example, I believe it's just fundamentally wrong. So in this example we have a frequency F coming in to two handlers, the top being

shown as X divided by 2, the bottom being X divided by 4.

In *Kim*, for example, these are PLLs. PLLs are not static like this. They are in fact changing. So it's not just X over 4. It's going to be X over Y, X over Z, such that these can change what they're doing to the incoming frequency independently. The Y does not depend on what you do with the Z, and vice versa. So your outcome is going to be the frequency divided by Y frequency divided by Z. And those can be changed completely independently without regard to what you're doing with the other.

You can have a common incoming. Let's just give an example and say it's 8. You can choose Y to be 2 and Z to also be 2, or you could choose Z to be 4 and keep Y as 2. They can change completely independently of one another, and your end signal is going to be whatever you want it to be, completely irrespective of what you have as your incoming signal F.

Now if we can jump back for a moment, jump back to slide 6, and we can talk about what the applicant was doing with this amendment. Defendants agree that -- or at least NXP agrees with this amendment, that the applicant added several additional limitations. It took what was just the first output clock signal and the second output clock -- or second clock signal and made it

the first output clock signal and added a phase lock loop, first and second phase lock loop and a first and second clock signal, as input to those phase lock loops, and set those first and second clock signals as inputs to be independent.

Now, why did the applicant do it? Turning to slide 7, here we have the interview with the examiner. The applicant is talking about how the clock signals 1 through 3 of its figure are different, independent clock signals going into the PLLs compared with *Jacobowitz'* disclosure of just a single signal, the V sub R, going into its local oscillators.

The examiner agreed that, yes, those things are different but it's irrelevant. It's irrelevant because the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims as they were at the time, i.e., just that the first set of processor cores is configured to dynamically receive a first clock signal with no regard to PLLs or whether that clock signal is an input to the PLL or an output to the PLL, covers not V sub R, but V sub 1 and V sub 0.

So what -- what all does that add. Well, let's look at figure - the patent's figure 3 on the next slide, slide 8. So I have color coded things here to hopefully make it a little easier to understand what all is now added and claimed. So we claim an output clock signal.

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Arlinda Rodriguez, do hereby certify that the foregoing was transcribed from an electronic recording made at the time of the aforesaid proceedings and is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, made from the proceedings in the above-entitled matter, and that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the Court and Judicial Conference of the United States.

/S/ Arlinda Rodriguez — April 1, 2025

ARLINDA RODRIGUEZ — DATE